

Burke, Teresita

From: Gary Richmond s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 1:29 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Turner Dairy

My objection is not to the development but to parking issues. I went to open house and was surprised by the plan to employ a mechanical car lift. Such a device is cumbersome and slow and will result in most residents probably parking on the street. A proper design to prevent this would be convention access ramp underground parking. This would be costlier to developer but would be fair to neighbours. Perhaps 30 additional cars could be using street parking.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential Thank you for considering my comment.

Sent from my iPad

Burke, Teresita

From: Michael Smit s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: Erin Rooksby
Subject: Resident comments on the 6 west 17th Ave proposed rezoning and development

To Whom it May Concern:

As residents of s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential directly across from the proposed re-zoning and development of "Turner Dairy" at 17th & Ontario - we would like to bring several considerations to attention regarding any rezoning and development of that property.

Having lived at this property for 8 years, neighbourhood parking has changed dramatically, driven by the growth on Main St and amplified by continuous development in the area. The proposed development calls for underground parking in the building, with 20 spots to serve 13 residences.

There are some inherent flaws with this proposition:

- **Street parking will be consumed first:** Residents of the proposed development will most assuredly elect to park on the street first, rather than choose to park downstairs and then take a return elevator to get to their street level accommodation.
- **No alternative parking for existing residents:** Notably, our property and all of the others on the east side of this development **do not have alleyways or driveways.**
- Guests to the 13 new residences will add to congestion (equal to 1 current block of residences).
- Underground parking use will have frequent garage noise implications for surrounding houses and add to cyclist danger & traffic (next point).
- **Bike route disruption & safety issues.** There is already no shortage of cyclist/driver incidents on this stretch of road, mostly due to the narrow roadway (with parking used up on both sides), as well as the steep pitch and "chicane" (unique turn in Ontario between 18th and 19th), and lack of consistent behaviour around the roundabout at 18th and Ontario. With this development, the risks are amplified as such:
 - Increased collision and "blind turns" caused by many vehicles in the multi-dwelling complex entering and exiting from the alleyway between 17th and 18th. I often come through the alley to park at our house and the duty of care to avoid pedestrians and cyclists is significant.
 - The lack of setback on the old building actually impedes view of sidewalk and pedestrians when coming out of the alley.
 - The expected massive increase in cars stopping to parallel park on Ontario St. will further congest the roadway.
 - The expected frequency of vehicles needing to turn around at the roundabout at 18th and Ontario to find parking, often requiring multi-point turns right at the bottom of the steep pitch.
 - More vehicles (and every year more bikes) accelerating down the steep pitch and speeding around the roundabout.

- *** worth noting our family are avid bikers, but also drive, and aside from this development the speed of bikers and cars coming down this stretch of Ontario is already a safety risk!

The disruption by trades parking, movement, and noise will no doubt be significant during construction as well. We often have had to park up to 2 or 3 blocks away due to single home trades projects taking up parking.


I don't believe anyone in the area considers the building or its architecture to hold any value whatsoever, it's more of an eyesore and a pedestrian hazard than anything else, so decisions must be made for residents, logistics, and safety first and foremost.

I hope these considerations weigh heavily on any decisions. There is a very real risk that introducing this development as described in the proposal will have detrimental effects on the movement of people in the area.

Best regards,

Michael Smit & Erin Rooksby

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Burke, Teresita

From: Jackie Labbe s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 8:52 PM
To: Public Hearing; Jackie Labbe
Subject: 6 West 17th Avenue (Turner Dairy)

Hello,

I am a resident s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
My biggest concern with this building project is the availability of parking in an already congested area. The City needs to ensure that current residents are not negatively impacted by this building. While I understand that 13 underground parking spots are being made available with the building, undoubtedly people and visitors to the new/proposed building will park on Ontario Street as this is a corner building and also because of the close proximity to parking space.

I would like to recommend the following: that the City assures that current residents are entitled to parking in front of their own homes through ADDRESS SPECIFIC parking. Block specific parking doesn't prevent other neighbors from parking in front of our own homes when they are displaced so this system is not acceptable. Also in the past, neighbors on this block were against block specific parking due to the annual cost charged by the City. Any cost for parking limitations imposed should be paid by the Developer or the City and not passed down to the residents. Home owners pay significantly high taxes already - this cost should be absorbed by the City.

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE TAKE THIS REQUEST SERIOUSLY. Our area has been increasingly impacted by lack of parking due to the increased traffic on Main Street, and due to increased number of rentals in our area.

Thank you.
Jackie Labbe

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Burke, Teresita

From: James Liboiron s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Saturday, February 10, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: public hearing for 6 West 17th Ave

Hello,

The scope of the requested change is too drastic. The building and lot at 6 West 17th Avenue are in a single-family area so the zoning change you're requesting does not fit the neighbourhood. From the local perspective, there is no need or desire to increase density on West 17th; the address is inside the busy streets. We do not want this precedent to be set. Keep the density to the busy streets and do not allow the excessive 13 residential units to be built in the space. A 4-plex would fit the lot size and seems reasonable for the neighbourhood.

Leslie Arnold

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Burke, Teresita

From: tony bai s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 7:26 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 6 west 18th av (turner dairy)

I submit that it is critical to address traffic management with the proposed development..the extra vehicles will add to an already congested environment on our block (adjacent- east 17th between ontario and quebec). I have lived as an owner on this block for 27 years and note increasing numbers of speeding vehicles on our block bypassing the congestion on 16th between ontario and main. With many young children now in our area we need speed humps or roundabouts on ontario at 17th and quebec at 17th to slow and dissuade traffic. The bike route on ontario in our zone needs more protection also-probably best done by roundabout or street narrowing at this intersection

In addition to the turner dairy traffic a new development of 3 dwellings at 71 east 17th will add between 3 and 6 vehicles to our block (no garages).

Tony Bai
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



February 13, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Turner Dairy Development

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

We are a family of four (mom, dad, and kids aged 11 and 14). My wife and I have lived in this neighbourhood for approximately 15 years, and have lived in our current home, across the street from the proposed development, for approximately 10 years.

We would like to raise some concerns with respect to the proposed development. Before doing so, we wish to emphasize that we are generally in favour of some form of improvement on that property: the current building is an eyesore.

With that said, a number of concerns should factor into any decisions made with respect to the proposed development, and we respectfully ask that these concerns be addressed. They include:

1. The property is currently zoned RS-7. The proposed development is, in effect, an attempt to use re-zoning to add density. However, there is no official community plan for development of RS-7 zoned properties in this context. We are opposed to using spot-rezoning and a heritage designation – particularly in the absence of a published community plan for such projects – to add density. We are opposed to the density levels proposed for this site.

A community plan is particularly important for this site given the unique features of this location: the property is situated on a designated bike route (Ontario Street), there are traffic routing “irregularities” (odd roadway patterns) at the north end (16th Avenue and Ontario Street) and south end (18th Avenue and Ontario Street) of the property that create real visibility and other safety concerns between bicycles and cars, along with laneway access onto Ontario Street in a “T-junction” from the west side of the street.

Our family depends on its van for transportation, but we are also avid cyclists. We love that Ontario is a bike route but, without onsite parking at our property, we also depend upon motor vehicle road access at this location. Given the current density, current traffic volume, and unique road routing characteristics, there are real safety concerns at this location.

The above factors weigh heavily against spot re-zoning without a considered and researched community plan for re-zoning of this RS-7 property.

2. We are informed that the existing structure has received Heritage "C" designation. We have not received any information about the scores this structure received in order to obtain such status. We have previously asked but have not received answers as to how the structure scored in the various criteria requirements for obtaining this "C" status.

This leads to a real skepticism about the transparency of the process. We are invested in this neighbourhood – it is our home and our (much loved) community. We are acutely interested in the manner by which this community is shaped. Transparency should be a hallmark of development. We dare say – and it is certainly our view – that the overwhelming majority of residence in this area would find little heritage value in the existing structure. Giving the existing structure Heritage "C" status, while failing to answer questions about the process and scores received by the structure to attain that status, is concerning.

It should not be forgotten that the proposed development involves (1) a significant – not marginal – relaxation of setbacks; (2) it proposes spot-rezoning; (3) it is situated on a bicycle route with inherent safety issues; and (4) it is situated on a block of Ontario Street with irregular road routing at either end of the proposed development. In this context any proposed development – particularly one that is non-conforming to existing norms - should not depend on an opaque heritage designation.

Furthermore, using a heritage designation is absurd when the property was a dairy for a scant period of its existence and merely a warehouse and manufacturing plant for the bulk balance of its existence.

We have reviewed the marketing material produced with respect to the history of the existing structure and this material's reference to the structure's architectural "style" and the structure's history of luggage (and other) manufacturing. However, all structures can be manipulated (sold) to fit within an architectural style, and items produced in virtually any manufacturing plant can be found with due diligence. The fact that an existing structure is described as fitting within an architectural style, and the fact that products produced in that structure can be located, does not equate to heritage value. "Old" does not necessarily mean "heritage value", and mere age and a manufacturing history is not a substitute for proper and transparent assessment of historical significance and value, or a lack thereof.

3. The proposed renovation of the existing structure is supported by very vague renderings. We feel that this is a deliberate attempt on the part of the developer and design professionals to avoid comment and critique on what it is they are proposing to do. We are simply unable to support the proposal in the face of such vague renderings. What is it that the developer is proposing to build? What will it look like (in detail)? And how will that plan integrate into the homes, roads, traffic levels, and uses of the area? This is a large structure (relative to its immediate surroundings) and we are unable to support the development without a more detailed rendering of what is proposed and an opportunity for consultation and input.

4. Within current RS-7 zoning, the property permits a maximum of 8.5 units, with on-site parking for each of them. What appears to be "elevator parking" in the current proposal seems a mere trick to conserve the existing footprint, rather than to address the substantive considerations that zoning restrictions are really designed and intended to address.

Careful development of this property should be permitted and, indeed, encouraged. However, any such development should properly require conformity and compliance with existing zoning. Development of the property should improve the area by establishing proper setbacks, parking, and by conforming to RS-7 density levels.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Philip Di Tomaso
Mary Cowan

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential